1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11		
12	IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. CV-07-5944-SC
13		MDL No. 1917
14	This Document Relates to:	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
15	ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
16		REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
17		Date: October 23, 2015 Time: 10:00 a.m.
18		Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti Courtroom: 1
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

The Court, having reviewed Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses (September 11, 2015) ("Motion"), the pleadings and other papers on file in this action, and the statements of counsel and the parties, hereby finds that:

- 1. The Motion requests an award of attorneys' fees in the amount of \$38,235,000 or 30% of the \$127,450,000 Settlement Fund. Further, Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs ("DPPs") and their counsel ("Class Counsel") request reimbursement of out-of-pocket litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$1,927,392.12. In addition, DPPs request that the Court approve the \$2,867,395.32 in expenses paid with settlement funds.
- 2. The Court finds that DPPs' requested fee award of \$38,235,000—30% of the Settlement Fund—is fair and reasonable under the percentage-of-the-recovery method based upon the following factors: (1) the results obtained by Class Counsel in this case; (2) the risks and complex issues involved in this case, which were significant and required a high level of skill and high-quality work to overcome; (3) that the attorneys' fees requested were entirely contingent upon success—Class Counsel risked time and effort and advanced costs with no ultimate guarantee of compensation; (4) that the range of awards made in similar cases justifies an award of 30% here; and (5) that the class members have been notified of the requested fees and had an opportunity inform the Court of any concerns they have with the request. These factors justify an upward adjustment of the Ninth Circuit's 25% benchmark. As such, the Court finds that the requested fee award comports with the applicable law and is justified by the circumstances of this case.
- 3. The Court has confirmed the reasonableness of DPPs' fee request by conducting a lodestar cross-check. The Court finds that Class Counsel's reasonable lodestar was \$43,335,517.50 based on historic hourly rates for the period from the appointment of lead counsel, May 9, 2008, through July 31, 2015 (the "Relevant Period"). Class Counsel's requested fee award represents

¹ The "Settlement Fund" consists of the total proceeds of the following settlements: (1) Chunghwa—\$10,000,000; (2) Philips—\$15,000,000; (3) Panasonic—\$17,500,000; (4) LG—\$25,000,000; (5) Toshiba—\$13,500,000; (6) Hitachi—\$13,450,000; and (7) Samsung SDI—\$33,000,000.

² The Relevant Period for DPP firms other than the Saveri & Saveri, Inc. is May 9, 2008 through July 31, 2014.

Case 4:07-cv-05944-JST Document 4055-37 Filed 09/11/15 Page 4 of 4

1	11. This order shall be entered of this date pursuant to Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules
2	of Civil Procedure, the Court finding that there is no just reason for delay.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
56	Dated:
7	HON. SAMUEL CONTI UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
25 26	
27	
28	
	2